

I'm a citizen providing free Internet access to my neighbors using an 802.11b radio. If I were required to subsidize Verizon for every connection made, as per paragraph 79 the cost would quickly outpace my charitable allowance. The additional accounting cost alone would place an undue burden on me. I provide my service as a member of NYCWireless (www.nycwireless.net), whose mission includes providing Internet access to government housing at little or no cost, and providing Internet access in public parks (such as our Bryant Park project in NYC, <http://www.bryantpark.org/>). Implementing such a tariff on not-for-profits or our Internet providers would hurt the very people that the universal service charge was intended to help.

I also oppose any tariff not based on cost of service as anti-competitive. Bandwidth or connection charges limit any new technology to be as primitive as that which came before it. Imagine if tomorrow someone invents a radio and networking technology that allows one to put billions of light powered radios in a field and provide 5 Terabit/sec communications at a cost of \$1 a month, if a 0.00001 cent per Kilobit tariff were in place that service would not cost \$1 a month, but up to \$7.5 trillion dollars a month. As a researcher and an observer of the telecommunications industry I don't think this is a very far fetched idea, but the bill certainly is absurd.

Now that telecommunications have been largely deregulated there is no reason why you should feel presured to keep the ILECs profitable. Should one or all go bankrupt their equipment and right of ways are sure to be purchased by their competitors and POTS will continue to be provided to all Americans.